

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/090,229

Applicant(s)

HILLER ET AL.

Examiner

Cynthia Hamilton

Art Unit

1752

All Participants:

(1) Cynthia Hamilton.

(2) Mr. David Liechty.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 2-3 June 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: Mr. David Liechty faxed in a Fig. 1 Drawing for the Examiner to use in the Examiner's amendment. See Attached Fax from Keil and Weinkauff of June 3, 2004.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

none

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, ~~since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.~~
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Cynthia Hamilton

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner explained that applicant's application was sent back to the examiner as a printer rush because the illustration on page 11 was required to be made a separate drawing instead of being embedded in the specification under current practice. Thus, the figure needed to be taken out of the specification on page 11 and made into a separate figure with appropriate cancellation of the figure from page 11 and any amendment needed to make reference to the figure in the specification fall within requirements for the application. The examiner agreed to cancel the figure from the specification, and stated no other cancellation or addition to the specification would be needed because the brief description to Figure 1 in lines 1-2 of page 11 in the specification was sufficient for a brief description of the drawings. Mr. Liechty agreed to fax in a Figure 1 which the examiner would use to form an Examiner's amendment and enter a Figure 1 into the application to allow the application to be printed. The fax is here made of record as an Attachment.



CYNTHIA HAMILTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER